



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/904,860	08/01/1997	HIROKAZU OHI	1232-4367	4593

7590 06/19/2003

CHRISTOPHER E CHALSEN
MORGAN AND FINNEGAN
345 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10154

EXAMINER

DINH, DUNG C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2003

33

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PRE

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/904,860

Applicant(s)

OHI ET AL.

Examiner

Dung Dinh

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 and 41-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 and 41-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 32.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2153

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/4/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. Regarding claims 1 and 11, applicant argues that the control information is not stored locally at the client not at the site. The argument is not persuasive because the claims do not specify where the control information is stored. As per the limitation of reading the network address and associated control information to access and control the device, Sergeant clearly teaches such limitation on col.6 lines 5-20 - microcontroller 46 read out address of remote camera unit 12a [col.6 lines 5-7], and command word and associated parameters to operate the camera unit [col.6 lines 18-20]. Furthermore, the rejection is based on the obviousness of setting a bookmark or shortcut to the camera control. Clearly, a bookmark or shortcut is stored locally at the client. When a bookmark or shortcut is activated, it is inherent that the information saved is read by the browser and submit to the site.

B. Regarding claims 23, 30 and 31, applicant argues that Niwa teaches tolerance limits for a machining process, hence is not applicable to serviceable range of a camera. The argument is not persuasive because the serviceable range of the camera is

Art Unit: 2153

the camera's tolerance limit. Niwa's machine is a mechanical devices that are operable by remote users. The camera is a mechanical device that can be control by the user. Niwa teaches providing the tolerance limits so as to enable the user to enter parameters within the machine operable range [fig.49, col.26 lines 18-26]. From the teaching of Niwa one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide serviceable range of the camera so as to enable that a user enters control parameters that are within the operable range of the camera. Hence, the rejection has established prima facie evidence of obviousness.

As per the limitation of sending the allowable range with the image information, Blackshear teaches to provide status information along with the image [col.9 lines 12-20, col. 10 lines 1-18]. Hence, Blackshear as modified by Niwa would have the serviceable range information transmit with the image to enable the user to see the status and allowable range of the camera under control.

C. Regarding claims 32, 33 and 34, the references teach comparing the value input by the user with the operable range of the device prior to sending the command to the device [see Niwa's fig.49 and Blackshear's fig.9]. Hence, it is apparent

Art Unit: 2153

that the system as modified would check for valid parameters at the client prior to sending it over the network to the camera.

D. Regarding claim 21, the examiner mistakenly omit it from the rejection header. However, the claim was rejected on page 7 of the office action under similar rationale for claim 2.

E. The limitation that the identifier is expressed as part of the resource name in the path in the URL is inherent from the RFC 1738.

RFC 1738 section 3.3. shows HTTP URL syntax takes the form of: "http://<host>:<port>/<path>?<searchpart>". In a conventional HTTP request for document, the "<host>:<port>" would contain the address of the document server, and "<path>?<searchpart>" would contain a resource name (including the path to the resource). The WebCam+ uses HTTP protocol to submit command from a browser to the WebCam+ server. Hence, it is inherent that a request submit from the browser to the WebCam+ would have the network address of the WebCam+ server in the "<host>:<port>" portion, and control information (i.e. identifiers and parameters values) in the "<path>?<searchpart>" portion. Hence, the system as modified would have the identifier expressed part of the "resource name" as claimed.

Art Unit: 2153

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1, 3-10, 49, and 11, 13-20, 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sergeant et al. US patent 5,517,236.

As per claim 1 and 11, Sergeant teaches a communication method comprising:

storing a network address [address code] of an object site [surveillance unit] into memory [see col.5 lines 52-58 and col.6 lines 21-25];

storing control information for a respective image input means [camera] of said object site in relation of said network address [col.5 lines 52-58, col.8 lines 1-12];

reading the address and control information stored and accessing said designated site [surveillance unit] using the address and control information [col. 6 lines 5-20, col.7 lines 55-60], wherein the control information include an identifier [command word] for identifying an item to be controlled by the

Art Unit: 2153

image input means [col. 4 lines 55-65, col.6 lines 18-20 and table 1].

As per claims 3 and 13, Sergeant teaches displaying received image information from said site [col.3 lines 65 to col. 4 line 9].

As per claims 4 and 14, Sergeant teaches generating control information according to manual designation [col.6 lines 30-52].

As per claims 5-9 and 15-19, Sergeant teaches the surveillance unit is a video camera. Sergeant teaches angle sensor [col.7 lines 45-50], controlling the camera focal distance [col.8 line 52] and shutter speed [col.11 line 2].

As per claims 10 and 20, Sergeant teaches computer program readably stored [col.6 lines 19-20].

As per claims 49 and 52, Sergeant teaches the control is stored separately from the address [col.6 lines 5 to 25].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject

Art Unit: 2153

matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 12, 21-22, 47-52 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sergeant and further in view of WebCam+ and RFC 1866 "Hypertext Markup Language - 2.0" and RFC 1738 "Uniform Resource Locators (URL)."

As per claims 2, 12 and 47-52, Sergeant does not teach controlling the camera over the Internet.

WebCam+ is a Web based remote control camera system. The system has a web browser form for entering commands for controlling the camera's position and zoom remotely over the Internet and deliver captured image via a web page [see page 2 "WebCam + Is Born ..."]. The system improved the prior art by enabling control of camera remotely via the Internet using a browser at a client computer.

Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Web technology as show by the WebCam+ teaching to the system of Sergeant because it would have enabled accessing and controlling the system over the Internet.

The WebCam+ article does not disclose the specific of storing the address and control command into a memory storage.

Art Unit: 2153

It is known in the art that Web request is URL encoded with the network address, path, resource name and optional parameters' [see RFC 1866 pp. 46-47 and RFC 1738 pp.2, 9-10]. It is known to encoded parameters within the path or resource name of the URL [see RFC 1378 pp.9-10 sections 3.3, and 3.4.1].

It is known that the encoded URL can be sent via clicking on the form's "submit" button or directly type in via the browser address box. Is also known that an URL can be saved in storage as a 'shortcut' on the desktop or as a browser's bookmark entry for quick access at a later time by the user.

It is apparent, in Sergeant system as modified, that the address of the camera site is a URL on the Internet. Sergeant teaches PRESET for storing control information for quick control of the camera at later time. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to save the camera control in a URL (with the network address and control values) in memory storage (for example via a shortcut or bookmark entry) because it would have enabled quick control of the camera to the desired position.

The steps of reading, accessing and transmission are apparent in the process of retrieving and submitting the bookmarked URL to the camera server.

Art Unit: 2153

As per claims 21-22, they are rejected under similar obvious rationale claim 2 as above. The recited limitations are inherent in the process of storing and retrieving the command URL in the browser's bookmark or shortcut.

Claims 23-34, 41-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackshear US patent 5,111,288 and further in view of WebCam+, and Niwa US patent 5,544,046.

As per claims 23, and 30-34, Blackshear teaches a camera control system comprising:

reception means for receiving request of sensing condition of the camera; and processing means for performing control processing of the camera based on the request [col.6 lines 6-22, col.9 lines 12-20];

transfer means for transferring image information obtained by the processing means with status of the camera [col.9 lines 12-20: "azimuth and elevation coordinates in degree"].

Blackshear does not teaches the system being a server controlling a camera according to request from remote a client over a general network.

WebCam+ is a Web based remote control camera. The system has an web browser form for entering controlling command for controlling the camera's position and zoom remotely over the

Art Unit: 2153

Internet and deliver capture image via a web page [see page 2 "WebCam + Is Born ..."]. The system improved the prior art by enabling remote control the camera via the Internet using a browser at a client computer.

Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Web technology as show by the WebCam+ teaching to the system of BlackShear because it would have enabled accessing and controlling the system over the Internet.

Blackshear does not specially disclose returning information indicating service allowable range of the camera.

Niwa teaches to store service allowable range of a device (tolerance limits) so as to let the system ensure that the user input of control parameters are within appropriate range and warn the user of any error [see fig.49, col.26 lines 18-26]. Given the teaching of Niwa, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to transmit service allowable range of the camera to the client because it would have improved the system by enabling the user to know the appropriate parameters for commanding the camera and enable the client to check for errors prior to submitting the command.

As per claim 24, the reference does not disclose control right. It would have been obvious to have control right in the

Art Unit: 2153

system as modified so as to provide access security and to regulate requests from multiple users.

As per claim 25, Blackshear disclose showing the sensing direction of the camera [col.9 lines 12-20: "azimuth and elevation coordinates in degree"]. Hence, it is apparent that the system as modified would show service allowable range for the sensing direction of the camera.

As per claim 26-29, since the Blackshear system is modified by WebCam+ to operate over the Internet. Is apparent that the processing would be done via HTTP message. It is well known in the art HTTP message passes request parameters in the header [GET] or the body of the message [POST]. See RFC 1866 pp.46-47 section 8.2.2 and 8.2.3.

As per claims 41-46, Blackshear teaches user controllable tilt, pan, zoom and focus. Hence, it is apparent that the request would have identifiers to identify items for controlling the camera [tilt and pan X-Y movement, zoom, focus, etc.]

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this

Art Unit: 2153

action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at (703) 305-4792.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7238, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE")

(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Application/Control Number: 08/904,860

Page 13

Art Unit: 2153

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II,
2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'D' followed by a horizontal line and a small loop.

Dung Dinh
Primary Examiner
June 12, 2003